

DEATH SENTENCES PASSED BY GREEK MILITARY COURTS (*continued*)

55. The CHAIRMAN read a letter from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the First Committee, in reply to Mr. Pearson's letter of 27 October 1949, concerning the death sentences passed by Greek military tribunals.

56. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his delegation reserved the right to return to that subject, since the Greek Government's reply to the President of the Assembly was in no way satisfactory and gave the impression that the Athens Government really wished to carry out the death sentences.

57. The CHAIRMAN referred to the summary record of the 276th meeting of the First Committee on 29 September 1949, and recalled that Mr.

Tsaldaris had stated his Government's intention to refer all the death sentences to a court of appeals.

58. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that it was the wish of the First Committee, as proved both by the vote taken on the Ecuadoran proposal (298th meeting) and by the explanations of votes, that the death sentences should be suspended. It was therefore probable that a large majority would be in favour of stating the wish of the First Committee on this matter without discussion. The Greek representative should have the courage to inform the First Committee of his Government's intentions and the First Committee should, if necessary, force the Greek Government to respect its wishes.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

### THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTH MEETING

*Held at Lake Success, New York, on Wednesday, 2 November 1949, at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).*

**Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece: report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans—general discussion—(*continued*)**

*At the invitation of the Chairman, the representatives of Albania and Bulgaria took seats at the Committee table.*

1. Mr. MEVORAH (Bulgaria) recalled that when Bulgaria had been accused of extending material help to the Greek liberation movement, Bulgaria had drawn the attention of the First Committee (175th meeting) to a serious drawback to the work of UNSCOB, namely, that all the witnesses were previously interrogated by the Greek Authorities. They had not been questioned before the Special Committee itself. Yet, the First Committee had proceeded to base its decision on the conclusions of that body. However, that fact had not been overlooked by Mr. Daux, the French representative on the Security Council Commission of Investigation, who had at that time expressed serious doubts as to the veracity of those testimonies. The French delegation had expressed similar views in the First Committee (172nd meeting) and in the General Assembly, and had pleaded that Albania and Bulgaria should not be condemned outright for violation of international law or their international obligations. Thus, judging from the way in which the resolution had been formulated, the General Assembly had not at that time assumed certain responsibilities. It had been recognized in a number of quarters that the allegations made had not been substantiated.

2. As to the sympathies Bulgaria had for the Greek liberation movement, the Bulgarian Government had never denied that it had the greatest sympathy and admiration for that movement. Any nation could clearly express its sympathy for any political group in such a divided world. It should be recalled in that connexion that some people had blamed the United Kingdom for having certain

sympathies for one of the parties involved in the Palestine struggle and that no one had ever denied that the United States had displayed similar sympathies for the other party. If that admiration for the Greek liberation movement constituted a crime, then the Bulgarian Government would plead guilty to the charges. However, when the report of the Special Committee alleged that Bulgaria had materially assisted the democratic movement in Greece, it was the duty of the Bulgarian Government to endeavour to prove the fallacy of those allegations. It was a true assertion that the independence of Greece was being jeopardized, but not by Bulgaria. If the national liberation movement were actually being helped by Bulgaria, obviously, some traces of that help, such as soldiers and war material, would have been left on Greek territory. Since nobody had been able to substantiate such an allegation, the accusations made by the Special Committee were therefore false. Moreover, even if those contentions were true, Mr. Mevorah was at a loss to understand why the United States was not accused of similar charges since that country had extended a much greater material help to the Athens Government. If it was a crime to supply a few rifles and bullets, the fact that the United States were supplying huge quantities of heavy war material and money should constitute a bigger and much more important crime. Naturally, it was contended that that help was extended to the Athens Government on the ground that the guerrillas were endeavouring to overthrow a duly established Government. Moreover, some speakers in the First Committee had expressed the opinion that the conclusions of the report should not even be questioned since the Committee should trust the judgment of the members it had appointed with a view to ascertaining the true state of affairs in Greece, and that it was beyond the ability of the representatives in the Committee to read all the documents related to the Greek question. Obviously, the First Committee was expected to take into account not only the conclusions of the report but also the facts which were of equal importance.

3. As to the evidence given by the various witnesses referred to in the report, Mr. Mevorah contended that their testimony was biased and therefore void, unless corroborated by material evidence. Paragraph 62 of the report admitted that those witnesses had usually been presented to the Special Committee by the Greek Liaison Service after having been interrogated and thoroughly screened. Obviously, only those expected to give information favourable to the Athens Government had been presented to the Special Committee. UNSCOB should have ruled out the testimony of those biased witnesses but, naturally, it could not have followed such a course, since it would then have possessed no evidence to enable it to formulate its alleged conclusions.

4. Moreover, having read the records of the interrogations of all those witnesses, Mr. Mevorah contended that the overwhelming majority of those witnesses had invariably declared that they had been forcibly recruited by the guerrillas. That statement could be easily understood since paragraph 62 admitted that a number of those witnesses had been under detention by the Greek Authorities pending further investigation. It was natural to expect those people to make such a statement, since any declaration to the contrary would have resulted in their imprisonment by the Athens Authorities.

5. Recalling the statement of Mr. McNeil (304th meeting) to the effect that if the veracity of paragraph 64 were disproved, then the position might change, the Bulgarian representative said that his delegation could easily submit evidence to prove the fallacy of that paragraph. Since that paragraph contended that the Special Committee had taken into account all the circumstances under which the testimony of witnesses had been obtained and that it was firmly of the opinion that the statements recorded in observation group reports, in accordance with the standardized procedure, faithfully reproduced the facts as described by the witnesses, the only inference that the Bulgarian delegation could draw from that contention was that the Special Committee had acted under bias, since it had taken for granted all the testimonies submitted to it. Furthermore, the paragraph in question explained that no single statement had been used by the Special Committee as a conclusive basis for any of its findings, and that the Special Committee had subjected the evidence of witnesses to close analysis and had carefully cross-checked statements made on the same subject by witnesses examined independently of each other. The paragraph also stated that it was from consideration of the cumulative evidence in the statements of witnesses, from direct observation which corroborated that evidence and from the other types of information referred to in paragraph 60, that the Special Committee had been able to reach its conclusions. The fallacy of that part of the paragraph was obvious, since the Special Committee had acknowledged, beyond any doubt, the veracity of a particular testimony as a result of the multiplicity of the same evidence. Accordingly, the conclusions of the Special Committee were wrong since they were based on a false premise.

6. Mr. Mevorah said that the report of the Special Committee should have been expected to have covered the period from 15 October 1948 to July 1949. Such delimitation had obviously been deemed necessary on the part of the Spe-

cial Committee in order not to merely repeat the accounts of events that had occurred before the Special Committee had received its new terms of reference from the third session of the General Assembly. Obviously, if the events of 1946, 1947 and early 1948 had been repeated in the present report, the Special Committee would then have acted against its terms of reference, and would have placed the accused in double jeopardy. The Bulgarian Government had been accused in chapter III of the report of materially assisting the guerrillas. But the Special Committee had condemned Bulgaria for facts that were alleged to have occurred before the period covered by the present report; thus the whole chapter dealing with material assistance was vitiated by the cardinal sin of double jeopardy. According to paragraph 94, all the evidence indicated that large quantities of military stores had been supplied to the guerrillas by Bulgaria and that the forwarding of supplies had been highly organized. That testimony had allegedly been given by witness No. 4/W/271. But the events described by that witness had occurred during the period of April to August 1948, namely, prior to the period covered by the report of the Special Committee. Moreover, according to the report, witness No. 4/W/204 had alleged that supplies had been taken from army depots to the border, usually under the supervision of Bulgarian soldiers, and that they had been turned over to the partisans, and that an effort had been made to check the stores in order to prevent those bearing Bulgarian markings from entering Greece. However, without questioning the truth of the testimony, the events described by that witness had occurred in June 1948. Besides, it was witness No. 4/W/271 who had given such testimony, and not witness No. 4/W/204. If a careful analysis were made, one would discover that more than half of the witnesses had given accounts of events that had occurred prior to the period covered by the report. If all the chapters of the report suffered from the same weakness, the report as a whole would be completely vitiated.

7. Moreover, if armed supplies had been furnished, as alleged, in great quantities, then obviously a great number of those arms, such as machine-guns, would have been left on Greek territory. However, after long and careful investigation, UNSCOB had only been able to find a small number of those arms, such as a box of hand grenades with Bulgarian tags, and another box bearing Bulgarian inscriptions containing fuses, as well as rifle bullets bearing similar inscriptions. The Special Committee had not taken into account the fact that it would be conceivable that such inscriptions could have been made by someone else. As to the contention that Bulgarian rifle bullets had been found on Greek territory, it was quite conceivable that those bullets and similar war material could easily have been left by the Bulgarian Army during its withdrawal from Greece under Nazi occupation.

8. Analysing the methods pursued by the Special Committee, Mr. Mevorah noted that the latter had drawn up a list of material found in a partisan headquarters in some part of Northern Greece after that headquarters had been captured by the Government forces. Citing the contents of that list, he concluded that the quantity and diversity of that material was not very great. To Observer Group 1, however, that materiel had

seemed large and varied, and the Special Committee had concluded that such large and diverse quantities of equipment could not have been produced or acquired in the area occupied by the guerrillas. As he had pointed out, however, the items referred to in that list might well have been acquired in the area. The Special Committee had then stated that those supplies must have largely or perhaps altogether come from areas outside Greece, probably from Bulgaria or at least through Bulgarian territory. Stating that there was no ground for such a conclusion, the Bulgarian representative pointed out that, according to the Special Committee, all the materiel found had been German with the exception of one Russian sub-machine-gun. That could hardly prove that the materiel must have come from Bulgaria. In fact, the conclusions of the Special Committee seemed to have been based on the discovery of a Bulgarian typewriter and uniform buttons, whose presence on Greek soil could only be explained by facts he had already alluded to. Citing other types of evidence used by the Special Committee, Mr. Mevorah quoted the text of a letter written by a Greek girl in a refugee camp in Bulgaria, which had been found on the body of a dead partisan. The Greek Liaison Officer had found the "real" father to whom the girl's letter had been addressed. After hearing the evidence of the "father", who had found that the letter contained certain strange expressions, the Special Committee had concluded that children in refugee camps in Bulgaria received instructions as to what to write in letters to relatives. However, that conclusion had been based only on that one letter. Pointing out that a separation of over a year in different surroundings might well be responsible for the use of new expressions, he wondered what expressions in such a simple letter could be found strange. The Special Committee's conclusion had clearly been without foundation.

9. Mr. Mevorah asked whether the evidence that had been submitted could convince the First Committee that Bulgaria had furnished the assistance that had been alleged and he pointed out that, as the USSR representative had stated, the Greek Government Authorities themselves had stated that the partisans obtained their weapons from such places as Italy and North Africa. Contraband was always an important factor in wartime and means were always found to transport arms to those who desired them. Viewing the matter in that light, it was clear that the Bulgarian Government, which had a 500 kilometre long frontier with Greece, could hardly be accused of having had anything to do with the minute quantities of Bulgarian weapons found on Greek soil.

10. Turning to another category of evidence, that of the testimony of observers, he recalled that Mr. Vyshinsky had dealt (300th meeting) with an incident in which observers of the Special Committee had seen a convoy which, as the USSR representative had demonstrated, could have been moving along a parallel road in Bulgarian territory. He informed the Committee that there was a large volume of traffic along that Bulgarian road on account of the construction of a near-by hydro-electric plant. Moreover, it would be seen from the map that the Greek troops, with the observer group, could easily have cut off the convoy on its return journey had the latter been travelling on Greek territory. In another in-

stance, partisans had been driven onto Bulgarian territory by a flanking movement of the Greek Army, which had been carried out on Bulgarian territory. The partisans had had to retire further or be captured. The observers accompanying the Greek troops, having seen certain defences on Bulgarian territory on the frontier, had concluded that the partisans had been permitted to build defences on Bulgarian territory. He wished to point out, however, that the main frontier defences in Bulgaria were situated some distance behind the frontier, and were connected with some ground-works and huts which were close to the frontier line. The latter were the fortifications which the partisans had occupied in order to defend themselves when attacked. The observers and the Greek Army had occupied those defences on the same day but had not found any Bulgarians in them. The Bulgarian forces had at that time been located at some distance behind the lines and had taken no part in the action. It might well be asked how Greek troops had come to be on Bulgarian territory, but such illegal incursions had been common and that particular occasion therefore had not been surprising. Such actions were characteristic of the Greek Government. However, it was quite another matter for an observer group, supposedly acting on behalf of the United Nations, to enter Bulgarian territory without having sought permission from the Bulgarian Government, and he had to protest against such acts, the serious nature of which could not be over-emphasized. The Bulgarian representative explained that while partisans had often entered Bulgarian territory, the Bulgarian Government had on such occasions done all that it should have done and had disarmed and interned all such persons. Mr. Mevorah contended therefore that the promise set forth in paragraph 64 of the Special Committee's report had not been kept and that it was clear that the report was not only full of contradictions but was quite without real foundation.

11. Describing the unhappy period in which Greek children had been forced to leave Greece, the Bulgarian representative said that his Government had found itself faced by the moral and humanitarian obligation to render assistance to those children. In that connexion, he outlined the measures taken and quoted paragraph 133 of the Special Committee's report to the effect that representatives of the International Red Cross had found the conditions in the camps for those children in Bulgaria to be satisfactory. He pointed out that those representatives had themselves chosen the camps they had subsequently visited and had found everything satisfactory. That fact had not received any attention during the First Committee's discussion. Mr. Mevorah added that the education received by those children was quite normal and was anything but the "warping" of children's minds described by the Greek representative in such a melodramatic way.

12. Recalling that in Paris during the previous session of the Assembly, the Bulgarian representative had agreed to the repatriation of Greek children through the intermediary of the Red Cross (195th meeting) and that similar assurances had been given to General Rómulo at the present session, Mr. Mevorah said that his Government had not impeded and would not impede that work. It was true that the Red Cross report had stated that it was awaiting the reply of the Bulgarian

Government regarding the lists of children that had been furnished. However, that could not be considered a criticism since the delay had been due partly to the late date at which the Red Cross had furnished those lists as well as to the technical delays inherent in that kind of work.

13. Mr. Mevorah denied that any children had been sent back to Greece into battle. It might well be that a few young partisans had been found on the battlefield, but the participation of such young people was a characteristic shared by all such historical movements. His Government had never either assented or favoured or given assistance to partisans to enable them to go back to the battlefield.

14. It was easy to make such accusations as were contained in the Special Committee's report, especially in view of the new methods of falsification that had been developed. However, it was always possible to distinguish between the true and the false by relying on common sense as well as on a sense of proportion. Thus, all the accusations contained in the new resolutions submitted by the Anglo-Americans and China amounted to nothing at all. Such proposals were typical of a policy of hatred. Were those delegations creating an atmosphere propitious to help the parties to reach an understanding? During the negotiations conducted by the Conciliation Committee, he had done his best to avoid creating undue and unnecessary difficulties. The only condition he had insisted upon had been that any agreement must include all the parties involved, a condition the more understandable in view of his country's friendly relations and ties with Albania. Agreement would easily have been reached had the Greek Government proved to be reasonable. With regard to the proposed commission to supervise implementation of the frontier convention, he had said that his Government would rather have a joint commission consisting only of the representatives of the parties without a neutral chairman; he had resorted to a rather flexible formula. He had said that his Government would prefer that the matter be subject to discussion and had been sure that agreement would have been reached rapidly because the other party would have understood his Government's position that it was preferable to have a commission consisting merely of representatives of the parties.

15. The Greek representative, in dealing with the frontier question, had spoken of Alsace and Lorraine. Mr. Mevorah found that example striking, since it could hardly be said that France and Germany had been on good terms after 1871. It could hardly be thought that peace would result from the establishment of a similar situation with regard to Albania and Greece. Since Mr. Pipinelis had defended and pressed his Government's claims, it was clear that those claims remained. In that connexion, the Bulgarian representative pointed out that it was always possible for a country to manufacture incidents and then go to war by saying that it had been attacked. He could not conceive of peace in the Balkans so long as relations between Albania and Greece remained a burning issue. The removal of the frontier question would settle the whole problem and permit his country to deal with the urgent task of reconstruction.

16. Mr. PIPINELIS (Greece) said that the Albanian representative's references to "collaborator

Tsaldaris" and to the "democratic pacification of Greece" had obviously been *lapsus linguae*. The same was obviously true of references to the "dishonest attitude" of the United States Government and to a "mechanical majority" in the Committee. The Greek representative recalled that the representative of Albania had been heard by the Security Council in December 1946 on the basis of a declaration that it accepted the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations<sup>1</sup> and accepted the decision of the Security Council on the matter under consideration, in the framework of the provisions of Article 25 of the Charter. Since that time there had been a series of official findings by organs of the Assembly, according to which the Government of Albania had failed to comply with the decisions of the General Assembly. He therefore wished to ask the representative of the Hoxa Government whether his Government was able to declare that it would unambiguously and without reticence accept the decisions taken by the Assembly.

17. The representative of the Hoxa Government had said that the charges of the Special Committee against Albania were false. The Special Committee had denied that. It would be logical and proof of good will to suppose therefore that the Hoxa Government was prepared and ready to declare that it would accept the findings on the situation by an international organ to be designated by the Assembly, which organ would be either the Special Committee or any other that might be appointed. That was the second question he wished to ask.

18. According to the Bulgarian representative, the conclusions of the Special Committee could not serve as a basis for a verdict by the Assembly. The Bulgarian Government had submitted a report which differed from the one submitted by the Special Committee. He therefore wished to ask the same questions of the Bulgarian representative, namely, whether the latter's Government was prepared to accept an international investigation on its territory designed to place those affirmations on an incontestable basis; and whether the Bulgarian Government was prepared to declare that having agreed to participate in the work of the Assembly under the conditions stated it would respect unequivocally the decisions adopted by the General Assembly.

19. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania), referring to the first question of the Greek representative, said that the Government of Albania had always agreed to comply and did comply with the general principles of the Charter, and therefore the allegation of Mr. Pipinelis were not in accordance with the facts. His personal opinion was that it was impossible to take a position on any decision to be adopted by the General Assembly when that decision was not even known and when his country was not given an opportunity to express its point of view on it. Recommendations of the General Assembly, which were not binding even on Members of the United Nations, might be at variance with the Charter. As to the second question, he believed that it was incompatible with the principles of sovereignty for anyone to interfere in the internal affairs of a State. Partisans crossing into Albanian territory had always been disarmed and placed in internment camps according to the principles of international law.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council*, First Year, Second Series, No. 26, page 609.

20. Mr. MEVORAH (Bulgaria), noting that the same questions had been put two years previously (69th meeting), said that the same answers must be given. He believed that the question had been put in the wrong way and that his Government should be asked whether it would accept a specific solution. If the question had been asked in that manner, his Government would have submitted its answer in due course. He pointed out that there was disagreement in the General Assembly itself regarding the matter raised in the second question of the Greek representative. Moreover, his country, though small, was proud of its sovereignty and could not accept an investigating committee designed to prove the allegations of Mr. Pipinelis.
21. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) noted that the Albanian representative had alleged that Yugoslavia was participating in aggressive plans aimed at Albania. The Yugoslav representative did not wish to dwell on the fact that that allegation formed part of a campaign which was not germane to the Greek question, however, to back up his allegation, the Albanian representative had not been able to do more than repeat slander published in a newspaper. Such slander was common in the Press of most of Eastern Europe. Yugoslavia had assisted Albania during the whole post-war period, and the present tension was due only to the participation of the Albanian Government in a campaign organized by certain States. The Albanian people had every reason to desire good relations with Yugoslavia, particularly in view of the threats of the Greek Government. By its accusations, however, the Albanian Government showed that it preferred to participate in the campaign to which he had already referred.
22. Mr. BELAÚNDE (Peru) said that the countries not directly concerned must consider what right Albania and Bulgaria had not to co-operate in the fullest degree with organs appointed by the United Nations. Quoting the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 6 of the Charter, the Peruvian representative said that it was obvious that participation would have been more than useful to Bulgaria and Albania as well as to other countries. He therefore wished to ask why those two countries had adopted an attitude of non-co-operation.
23. Mr. MEVORAH (Bulgaria) said that that question had already been answered during previous sessions of the General Assembly as well as in the replies made by his Government to the communications received from the Secretary-General. In order to save the Committee's time, he would submit a written reply to the Chairman.
24. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania) said that the Peruvian representative's statement was incorrect, as his Government had assisted and co-operated with the Security Council Commission of Investigation. However, his Government had never recognized the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans and had never participated in that body's work.
25. Mr. J. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the questions of the Greek representative involved the honour of the United Nations. Being accustomed to complying with ultimatums without any qualms, the Greek representative proposed that a blank cheque ultimatum should be presented to sovereign States. Such a proposal was unprecedented and inadmissible.
26. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), quoting paragraph 121 of the Special Committee's report concerning distribution of children to combat units, asked the Albanian representative whether such cases as were mentioned in that paragraph had ever occurred.
27. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania) replied that he believed that the whole Committee agreed that the accusations contained in that paragraph were untrue.
28. Mr. MAKIN (Australia) asked the representatives of Albania and Bulgaria for the exact number of Greek guerrillas and refugees interned in their countries.
29. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania) and Mr. MEVORAH (Bulgaria) stated that they would submit their replies to the Chairman in writing.
30. Mr. DE LA TOURNELLE (France) said that while the loss of Alsace and Lorraine, referred to by the Bulgarian representative, had created lasting resentment against the Germans, the question of those two provinces had not been involved in the origins of the First World War. The Bulgarian representative had therefore misinterpreted that point of history.
31. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) asked the Albanian and Bulgarian representatives whether they did not believe that the question put by the representative of Australia was designed to complement the intelligence data of the Athens Government.
32. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania) agreed that that was the case. His delegation had already stated that such questions were designed to complement the Greek Government's information.
33. Mr. MEVORAH (Bulgaria) said that the answer was perfectly clear.
34. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), in respect of a point raised by the Greek representative, asked what portraits were displayed in schools for Greek children in Albania and Bulgaria.
35. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania) pointed out that there were no Greek children in Albania.
36. Mr. MEVORAH (Bulgaria) replied that numerous portraits of illustrious men were displayed in the corridors of such schools, including, among others, persons prominent in the history of the USSR as well as figures from the literature and history of other countries. There was no reason to forego admiration for such men as Marx and Engels, who would ultimately receive their due even in the United States.
37. In reply to a question put by Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic), who asked if those portraits included that of Ivan Vasov, the author of *Freedom of Bulgaria*, who had written so much about the independence of his country, Mr. MEVORAH (Bulgaria) stated that the portraits referred to did include Ivan Vasov, who was widely read in this country.
38. Mr. J. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the representatives of Albania and Bulgaria considered that their Governments, in participating in the work of the Conciliation Committee, had displayed an ardent desire to co-operate with the United Nations in maintaining and strengthening peace.

39. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania) replied that whenever invited, his Government had participated in the work of all such international bodies whenever such participation could help to strengthen peace and security throughout the world. The Albanian Government had welcomed any initiative towards that goal.

40. Mr. MEVORAH (Bulgaria) said that he had worked in Geneva with the representative of Mexico at a Red Cross Conference and he could tell the Committee that Bulgaria had contributed to all initiatives taken under the aegis of the United Nations in a spirit of co-operation. The Bulgarian representative had received instructions from his Government to do everything in his power to further the work of the Conciliation Committee, and he had done so. The records and reports of that Committee, however, contained the implication that his Government had not extended sufficient support to that Committee's work and had given its reply too late. Explaining the reasons for delay in that reply, he stated that the implication was false, since it had not been the fault of his Government that there had been delay.

41. Sir Terence SHONE (United Kingdom), noting that the representatives of Albania and Bulgaria had advanced reasons for which their Governments were not disposed to permit international inspection of camps in which guerrillas were interned, wished to ask what those two Governments intended to do so with such persons taking into account the facts that there was a large number of guerrillas in Albania and some in Bulgaria, and the statement of the so-called "Democratic Army" that it had only grounded its arms temporarily.

42. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania) replied that the statement that there was a substantial number of Greek partisan soldiers in Albania was not in accordance with the facts. The numbers of partisan and monarcho-fascist soldiers who had crossed the border and been interned had been reported regularly to the Secretary-General. The soldiers at present in his country would be disposed of in accordance with international law.

43. Mr. MEVORAH (Bulgaria) replied that the persons in question were respected as refugees and were given the internationally accepted right of asylum. Those refugees would return to Greece when the conditions had gone back to normal and when they no longer ran the risk of being interned and when a different atmosphere prevailed in Greece. The United Kingdom representative might prefer that the Bulgarian Government should turn out those refugees, but such action would involve failure to respect the right of asylum.

44. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) asked the Albanian representative whether the Greek Government's covetous designs on Albanian territory and its refusal to recognize the Greek-Albanian border as final helped to foster friendly and normal relations between Greece and Albania.

45. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania) replied that his Government's views had already been made clear. The refusal to recognize the border between Greece and Albania as final was an indication of the Greek Government's future intentions. The behaviour of the Greek Government did not serve

the cause of peace and was not in accordance with the interests of the Greek people themselves.

46. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked how the Government of Albania viewed the so-called "Free Albania Committee" which was active on French territory and whose purpose it was to overthrow the present people's democratic régime in Albania.

47. Mr. PRIFTI (Albania) replied that the establishment of that so-called "Free Albania Committee" in France and the activities of those in sympathy with it in France, the United States and the United Kingdom were evidence of the negative and unfriendly attitude of those Governments towards his Government and people.

48. Mr. DE LA TOURNELLE (France) said that he had no official information whatsoever on the existence of such a committee. However, he supposed that there were in France a great number of Albanians enjoying the right of asylum referred to by the representative of Bulgaria. Since Albania and France entertained absolutely regular and correct diplomatic relations, it was through the intermediary of their representatives that the Albanian Government could address itself to the Government of France.

#### Point raised by the representative of Yugoslavia (*continued*)

49. Mr. J. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the statement made by the Yugoslav representative at the 302nd meeting of the First Committee regarding the alleged fact that Hungarian troops and border guards had opened fire along the Yugoslav border and had kept firing throughout the night of 28 October 1949, said that according to authoritative and authenticated information at the disposal of the USSR delegation, what had happened on the Hungarian-Yugoslav border had been quite at variance with what Mr. Bebler had alleged. The latter's statement had been nothing but a provocation, while Mr. Bebler himself in that question looked like a hired provocateur and warmonger.

50. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) said that apparently the Committee had no ways or means of investigating the incident brought to its attention by the Yugoslav delegation. The Hungarian version had come two days later and had been "doctored" in order that the wrong side of the picture might be given. The language used by the representative of a great Power in connexion with the statement made by the representative of a small State, was quite typical and was the language Yugoslavia had heard for the past eighteen months, it also resembled the language used by the Athens Press in speaking of Greek partisans. He did not consider that it redounded to the credit of the USSR representative to use such language.

51. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) said that the representative of Yugoslavia who had raised such serious charges, which were not confirmed by any evidence, must be described as a provocateur. He endorsed, therefore, the statement made by the USSR representative.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.